# REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 583 VT 003 670

OPERATION RETRIEVAL--IMPACT ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS MADE BY MDTA EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. FINAL REPORT.

BY- WICKLAND, ROGER F.

HUMAN INTERACTION RES. INST., LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60 88P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, YOUTH PROGRAMS, *EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, PROGRAM EVALUATION, SURVEYS, *DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, *COMMUNITY AGENCIES (PUBLIC), *PRIVATE AGENCIES, MDTA PROGRAMS,

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY WAS TO EVALUATE THE "IMPACT" MADE ON COMMUNITY AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS AT THE LOCAL AND NATIONAL LEVELS BY THE EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION (E AND D) YOUTH PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE OFFICE OF MANPOWER POLICY, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH (OMPER). THE PROJECTS WERE DIRECTED TOWARD DEVELOPING AND DEMONSTRATING NEW WAYS OF MEETING THE EMPLOYMENT NEEDS OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. OF ABOUT 55 SUCH YOUTH PROJECTS ACTIVATED SINCE PASSAGE OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT IN 1962, 14 WERE VISITED PERSONALLY. "IMPACT" WAS VIEWED AS HAVING TWO MAJOR ASPECTS -- (1) THE DEGREE TO WHICH PROJECTS SECURED COOPERATION FROM AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS RELEVANT TO THE REALIZATION OF PROJECT GOALS, AND (2) THE DEGREE OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT FINDINGS BY OTHER AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS. DATA WITH REFERENCE TO IMPACT CLAIMED ARE PRESENTED FOR BENEFIT-RECEIVERS OR POTENTIAL CONSUMERS OF E AND D PROJECT FINDINGS AT LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS. ON AN OVERALL BASIS, OMPER E AND D PROJECT "IMPACT" WAS VERY SIGNIFICANT. APPENDIX A LISTS E AND D PROJECTS VISITED, AND APPENDIX B LISTS E AND D PROJECTS WHICH HAVE BEEN CONTINUED BY REGULAR PROGRAMS. (PS)

"Special Manpower Volume"

ED014583

OPERATION RETRIEVAL

# Impact on Community Organizations and Institutions Made by MDTA Experimental and Demonstration Projects for

# disadvantaged youth

Final Report, Prepared for:
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation,
and Research,
U. S. Department of Labor
June, 1967

Human Interaction Research Institute
10889 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024

VT003670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OPERATION RETRIEVAL

# IMPACT ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS MADE BY MDTA EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Final Report, Prepared for:
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
U.S. Department of Labor

Contract No. 82-05-67-34
December 14, 1966 - June 15, 1967

Project Director
Edward M. Glaser, Ph.D.

Principal Investigator
Roger F. Wickland, M.A.

Human Interaction Research Institute
10889 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024

June, 1967

---

This report was prepared under a contract with the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Organizations undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

SUMMARY i

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE 6

III. FINDINGS 9

A. Local and State Levels 9

B. National Level 36

IV. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS 52

V. RECOMMENDATIONS 58

APPENDICES

## 1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this survey is to evaluate the impact made on community agencies and institutions at the local and national levels by the Experimental and Demonstration (E & D) youth projects funded by the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research (OMPER). The projects were directed toward developing and demonstrating new ways of meeting the employment needs of disadvantaged youth.

There have been about 55 such youth projects since passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) in 1962. Fourteen of them were visited personally in connection with this survey. Project directors and key staff, when available, were interviewed. Some phone calls were made to other agencies in given communities. In the main, however, the impact information reported here represents the collated views of E & D project directors and their staffs, and has the obvious limitation of less-than-comprehensive inputs. We believe, however, that experience reported by directors and others from a sample of 14 important E & D projects is relevant and valuable.

For the purposes of this study we view impact as having two major aspects: (1) the degree to which projects secured cooperation from agencies and institutions relevant to the realization of project goals, and (2) the degree of utilization of project findings by other agencies and institutions.

In some areas served in the E & D projects, cooperation from established agencies and institutions was successfully secured. In many instances cooperation was the result of lengthy, difficult negotiations which delayed project operations and limited overall project effectiveness. These problems of cooperation can be attributed to three main sources: negative attitudes, insufficient resources, and inadequate planning.

In the extreme cases, there were negative attitudes of defensiveness and hostility on the part of the agency staff members. They saw the projects as encroaching on their areas of competence and activity. The very existence of an E & D project implied criticism of their efforts. They could not or would not accept changes. Policies were inflexible in the hands of agency personnel. They worked in a slow and methodical manner as contrasted with E & D staff members who felt a constant sense of urgency and pressure about their goals. This clash of conflicting attitudes hardly could facilitate quick and easy cooperation.

Many agencies which would have been delighted to cooperate in working on certain E & D projects were unable to do so because their resources were already stretched to the limit by other demands. Agency staffers were unable to spare space, equipment and personnel to projects when they lacked enough for their own needs.

Too much speed, unadjusted to the digestion and coordination needs of the project, usually correlates negatively with quality, developmental maturity and efficiency of operation. Most E & D projects were launched with great pressure to "hurry up and get the show on the road." The "show" does get on the road more quickly that way, and some real needs thereby get met more immediately. But one can expect at least a larger-than-otherwise batch of "wrinkles" to appear in the process which call for subsequent ironing out. The speed with which E & D projects got underway often precluded planning time to pretrain and orient the project staff to its own philosophy, methods and goals, and to establish cooperative relationships with outside agencies so essential for project success.

Aside from time pressures, it is our observation that many of the E & D project personnel had insufficient experience for the responsibilities they were asked to handle. It thus became tempting and perhaps natural to project the blame for their difficulties onto the established agencies. If the E & D people had displayed as much ingenuity in approaching established agencies as they did in approaching problem individuals, the record concerning cooperation might well read better. If we had interviewed persons from established agencies regarding E & D project operations, we probably would have received just as large a laundry list of complaints.

The following is a summary of E & D youth project techniques or operating procedures adopted and utilized by regular agencies and institutions:

--Outreach:

The technique used by E & D projects of recruiting youth in their own neighborhoods in New York City (MFY, PAL), New Haven, Connecticut (CPI) and elsewhere has become an integral part of the YOC's and numerous other anti-poverty programs.

-- Group Counseling:

Group counseling, including multi-hour and multi-day session demonstrated in Los Angeles (YOB-YTEP), Chicago (JOBS) and other projects, is now being widely used in YOC and other human development-manpower programs.

-- Use of Nonprofessionals:

Many of the E & D projects demonstrated the value of indigenous personnel and other nonprofessionals in various important project roles. Nonprofessionals are now used on a large scale in most anti-poverty programs. The BES Counselor Aide University Summer Education (CAUSE) program was an outgrowth of E & D experience.

-- Work Sample Testing:

This technique was developed and demonstrated by the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service-sponsored E & D projects in Philadelphia and St. Louis. Now, four YOC's in New York are subcontracting for this service. BES has requested funds for Work Sample Testing for the Philadelphia YOC and is considering the adoption of this technique by the YOC's on a nationwide basis.

-- Instructional Materials:

Materials developed first by the Bedford-Stuyvesant New York YMCA project and the Division of Manpower Development and Training later were further developed by educational research firms, and then were picked up by the National Automobile Dealers Association for a nationwide training program. Programed instructional materials developed by the E & D project at the Draper Correctional Center in Alabama have aroused nationwide interest and probably will be used in other correctional institutions, and by other institutions serving people with comparable education.

-- Post-placement Counseling:

Many E & D projects found this highly useful to assist project graduates in adjusting to new jobs. Ongoing counseling was also recognized to be vital to maintaining trainee motivation and in handling adjustment problems during various types of training. Many YOC's and other manpower programs now utilize these techniques.

-- The One-stop Neighborhood Multi-service Center:

Most E & D projects found that the ready availability of comprehensive services was necessary to really prepare the disadvantaged for employment. The frequent need for physical and mental health services, rehabilitation services, basic skills training, legal and other services, was amply demonstrated. As a result, enabling legislation was passed and guidelines were promulgated embodying the multi-service neighborhood center concept. Partial implementation of the concept has occurred in the YOC's and in several state and local anti-poverty programs, such as at Hunter's Point, California.

-- Work Crews:

The concept of small, carefully supervised work crews, with the later refinement of varied and graded work experience, was developed and demonstrated by Mobilization for Youth in New York City, Community Progress Incorporated in New Haven, Connecticut, and the Mayor's Youth Employment Project in Detroit. This concept subsequently has been adopted by the Neighborhood Youth Corps in many areas.

-- Training, Placement and Support for Prison Inmates:

This procedure was successfully demonstrated by the Lorton and Draper E & D projects. Now, through MDTA amendment, correctional institutions throughout the nation are encouraged to apply for pilot program funds from USES to conduct institutional training for inmates, coupled with efforts to find jobs in the community before the prisoner is released, and with follow-up counseling support. The learning and experience from the Draper project is being widely shared through a series of OMPER-sponsored Draper Conferences, the first of which was held in Montgomery, Alabama, May 23-25, 1967, and was attended by over 100 persons from 10 - 11 states.

-- Armed Forces Cooperation:

The National Committee for Children and Youth, sponsors of an E & D project, received referrals from Armed Forces recruiting offices of youth rejected as volunteers for military service. It was found that disadvantaged youth, at this critical point, were more than usually amenable to manpower services aimed at remedying the deficit which rendered them unfit for the armed services. Under BES operation but OMPER funding, and with consultation from NCCY staff, manpower services performed by YOC's are being linked to armed forces recruiting facilities in a number of cities across the nation.

-- Labor Union Participation:

Although efforts to gain labor union participation met with mixed success in the E & D projects, the experiences of the NILE projects as well as MFY in New York, JOBS in Chicago, and the Citizens Committee on Youth in Cincinnati, among others, clearly demonstrated the necessity for and possibility of having close union involvement in the planning and operation of training programs, particularly in the apprenticeship area. The

NILE-developed training programs involving both institutional and on-the-job training were union-sponsored and designed to enable trainees to meet apprenticeship requirements. This approach, while only partially successful, appears to hold much promise if the lessons learned in this project are applied in the future. (See Final Report on OMAT Project P-3-63, entitled "The Youth Employment Program," especially pp. 77-89.)

-- Employer Involvement:

E & D projects in St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit, and MFY in New York City were particularly successful in securing job openings from major employers. Job development staff members from these projects could be profitably employed as consultants to other E & D projects and to a wide variety of anti-poverty programs involving job development. As consultants they could communicate their insights and experiences to good effect in this difficult area.

-- Urban Redevelopment:

The Citizens Committee on Youth sponsored an E & D project in Cincinnati which demonstrated that disadvantaged youth could gain valuable work experience, and in some cases pre-apprentice training, in the building trades while helping to rehabilitate deteriorated homes under union journeyman supervision. There is widespread interest in the model, and in a number of cities efforts are being made to adopt it. OMPER and HUD have been collaborating in this area to develop models which can be utilized in other communities, and will conduct a conference in Cincinnati to refine and disseminate them.

In addition to the foregoing categories of impact (cooperation and utilization), E & D projects have contributed to a number of positive legislative and institutional changes. For example:

1. The Nelson-Scheuer amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act extended work experience to adults rather than just to Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees.

2. Through outcomes of experience with earlier projects it was determined that eligibility for training allowances should be broadened and that training allowances should be increased.

3. The federal government has created new job categories and made changes in civil service regulations to broaden opportunities for disadvantaged persons.

4. The MDTA Act of 1962 has been amended -- as a consequence of E & D experience -- to provide a special program for the testing, counselling, selection and referral of disadvantaged youths sixteens years of age or older for occupational training and further schooling, and a similar referral program, if needed, for persons forty-five years of age or older, and for other persons who need basic education and communications and employment skills to render them employable. In addition, there is now provision for appropriate physical examinations, medical treatment and prostheses up to $100 per person. These amendments further provide an experimental program for part-time training of persons, including employed persons, to meet skill shortages where they exist in given areas or occupations. Training allowances are not now counted as income for determining State plans for payment under the Social Security Act. Provision has been made (up to June 30, 1969) to develop and carry out E & D programs of training and education for persons in correctional institutions who are in need thereof to obtain employment upon release.

5. Perhaps the major institutional outcomes of the E & D projects, at least within the Labor Department system, have been the establishment of the Youth Opportunity Centers and the Human Resources Development Centers. The latter extends to hard-to-place adults the same kind of assistance now provided primarily to youth through the YOCs.

Summary of Recommendations to Increase Impact:

- Increase OMPER program staff to facilitate closer and more frequent contact between OMPER and projects, including quicker response to requests from projects.

- Build utilization plans, including budget and staffing provision, into project proposals.

- Begin evaluation or follow-up studies early enough during the project's life so that projects may benefit from ongoing feedback and the evaluation may profit from early data collection capability and contact with project staff and experiences which often are unavailable during the later stages of a project.

- Involve individuals from both potential users and cooperating agencies and institutions in the planning, operations, and evaluation of E & D projects at the management, supervisory and line levels. Also involve key staff from agencies in related fields as consultants and wherever feasible use their insight into common problems.

- Give new E & D projects sufficient lead time to contact and carefully inform and involve relevant local community agencies and institutions regarding project aims and general approach or means for achieving those aims.

- Conduct specialized group "sensitivity training" sessions, including E & D project staff and staff from cooperating community agencies.

- Conduct regional conference sessions where projects can share experiences with each other and with OMPER.

- Plan and fund more "utilization projects" in which key E & D staff from successful projects act as trainers and "innovation catalysts" in regular programs.

- Utilize E & D experienced personnel to develop project staff training programs in the area of job development -- in relation to both unions and employers. Reduced job-finding caseloads, or increased staff, may be necessary to permit real job development.

- Develop closer liaison between OMPER and the U.S. Office of Education to stimulate State and local vocational educators to develop new knowledge and increase the use of existing knowledge to make MDTA Instructional and basic communication skills training much more appropriate to the needs of the disadvantaged. Currently, E & D projects have insufficient authority to press effectively for improvements in special teaching skills and training curricula.

- Provide E & D staff and other experts in a consultant role to help YOC's and other anti-poverty programs implement techniques spelled out in their own E & D-influenced guidelines (e.g., outreach, group counseling, use of nonprofessionals, etc.)

- Institute Career Service Awards, or a sabbatical time period (six months to one year) no oftener than every four years nor less often than every seven years for all key professional and administrative staff who are judged capable of thereby probably making a significant contribution to OMPER, the government, and their own development.

- Provide in-service training for OMPER professional program staff and research people in report writing and editing.

- Refrain from funding any project, no matter how needed or valuable the service it proposes to perform, until the E & D and service design has been coupled with some appropriate means -- control groups, or baseline date, or before-after measures, or video tape recordings, or whatever may be appropriate to the given situation and type of project -- for measuring efficacy of the different parts of the service to be offered and of the total intervention effort.

- Support studies of the "dynamics" of unusually successful projects as soon as it appears evident that a given E & D project which is attacking an important problem is, in fact, achieving a breakthrough or major advance of some kind. By "dynamics" we mean the living elements of what the people involved did to achieve the seemingly unusual results, not just the outcome statistics or summaries of procedures and forms. Video-tape recordings, participant-observer case study reports, recorded interviews with those involved (E & D project staff, clients, other agencies, etc.) may be appropriate for this purpose.

- Collate, publish and keep up-to-date the valuable learnings, successful procedures and techniques from E & D projects in clear, concise, easily-usable state-of-the-art reports, so that other workers tackling similar problems can take advantage of what already has been developed and found clearly helpful.

* * * * * *

On an overall basis, OMPER E & D project impact has been very significant. In addition to the outcomes that have been summarized, a number of E & D projects have been spun off to become components of Community Action Programs, and others have continued on a regular basis with BES or BAT funding (see Appendix B for list). The Hunter's Point, California, project became a YOC and it is likely that the Richmond Neighborhood House project, where ES personnel are in the same building with the E & D project staff, will soon come under permanent ES auspices.

Negative findings have not been without value. While many projects were unsuccessful in relation to their stated objectives, and in too many projects competent evaluation of intervention outcomes was almost impossible because faulty research design would not permit assessment of relative efficacy, some valuable lessons nevertheless were learned about how not to proceed. For example, the failure of normal communication media to be effective in outreach efforts; the inapplicability of standard educational achievement and aptitude devices, such as the USES GATB tests; the inadequacy of available basic education materials for functional illiterates at the time the E & D programs got started; the inability of the indigenous nonprofessionals to perform all tasks in the role of aides...led to a creative thrust for the development of new training devices and approaches to fill unmet needs.

The worth of many manpower program innovations has been demonstrated and there no doubt are additional constructive influences which have not yet been explicitly identified and documented. The problems of achieving improved dissemination and utilization of worthwhile findings now are receiving belated but heartening and effective attention by several government agencies, among them OMPER, NIMH, VRA and OE.

An Interagency Project Review Committee, instituted early in 1966, brought together representatives of Washington agencies such as OE, USES, BAT, and others when appropriate -- such as VRA on some projects. The cooperation of these agencies was essential for the effective local operation of E & D projects. This Committee has smoothed out many of the complaints that previously had been encountered, many of which were recounted (and reported) in the course of this survey. The need for such a committee was demonstrated by experience on earlier E & D projects.

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the major aims of the U.S. Department of Labor's experimental and demonstration (E & D) youth projects, financed under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, is to develop new ways to meet the employment needs and problems of disadvantaged youth. The purpose of this study is to identify and assess the impact made by these projects on the broad range of public and private community organizations and institutions (e.g., state employment services, educational institutions, employers, unions, trade associations, civil services, health and welfare authorities, etc.) which have traditionally had some regular role in and/or responsibility for specific activities similar to those undertaken by the E & D youth projects.

The focuses of the study are as follows:

1. To identify noteworthy issues of controversy between the E & D youth projects and related public and private community organizations and institutions.
2. To describe the nature and flow of events where observable impact on community organizations and institutions was made (e.g., institutional change through use of new techniques, development of new regulations, etc.) by one or more projects.
3. To describe the nature and outcomes of situations where little or no success was achieved in resolving conflicts between the E & D project and one or more ongoing community organizations and institutions.

4. To identify the relative effectiveness of various strategies utilized to maximize the impact of the project on public and private organizations and institutions.
5. To identify the short-term and long-term implications of those situations where significant impact was made by the projects.
6. To suggest strategies and procedures for maximizing the impact to be made by future E & D projects on established public and private organizations and institutions at local and national levels.

The term "impact" as used in this paper refers to (1) success in involving the assistance of regular agencies and institutions in achieving E & D project goals, and (2) success in achieving the dissemination and utilization of these techniques, knowledge and information by permanent public and private agencies and groups responsible for meeting the employability needs of disadvantaged youth.

The goal of impact is to effect positive change in the traditional or regular agency or institution. Change can take place in many ways and at many levels. For example, as a result of E & D project findings, a State Employment Service or local school system might adopt group counseling as a means of assisting more youth, without an increase in professional manpower. Changes might take place in attitude, in that employers might see disadvantaged, minority group youth as potentially trainable and productive employees rather than as irretrievably deviant and unproductive. At still another level, change might take place in legislation which would, for example, authorize special types of financial assistance for youth who otherwise could not afford and/or be motivated to undertake training.

Once dissemination of knowledge and information to potential users has taken place, the utilization component of impact becomes paramount. Utilization can further be divided into the following categories:

Spread

The adaptive tryout of a project technique by other workers with other groups in other areas.

Continuity

The continuation of the original project on a more permanent basis, perhaps on an expanded scale so as to use newly developed knowledge as a base for further knowledge-development actions.

Spin-Off

The carrying out of an innovative activity by an ongoing agency other than the original funder once it has been demonstrated to be successful.

Spillover

This may be of two types: (1) to attract attention to a problem, with the E & D project serving mainly as a catalyst to get persons confronted with that problem to experiment with constructive action; (2) to encourage secondary application of the experimental or demonstration findings: for example to apply the technique of teaching English as a foreign language to the teaching of disadvantaged youth whose native language is English.

"Production engineering" of E & D-developed techniques and knowledge to translate them from the nurtured environment of a small-scale project conducted with special personnel to the conditions of everyday operation on a larger scale by less specialized personnel, may be called for by any of the preceeding categories of utilization. Sometimes another function of an E & D project is to serve as a hypothesis generator as well as a "living example" of the application of project findings.

To evaluate in depth the degree and efficacy of impact of a given E & D project would require intensive survey among potential user agencies likely to be influenced by the demonstration. The budget and time limitations for this follow-up study made intensive, in-depth investigation impracticable. Instead, the decision was made to review all available reports on about 50 important E & D youth projects for disadvantaged youth conducted during the period 1963 - 1966, with 14 visited personally. (A list of projects visited may be found in Appendix A.) In these visits the focus was on eliciting impressions of and evidence for impact on relevant community agencies and institutions, mainly as perceived by the directors and key staff members of these 14 projects. In connection with the 41 projects not personally visited as part of this study, the reports were analyzed for evidence regarding impact. This is an admittedly biased and incomplete way of trying to arrive at an assessment of impact on community organizations and institutions made by these projects, but it is by no means an irrelevant or valueless way. These E & D project directors and their key staffs were (or are) in the front lines of the poverty war, and their perceptions of what happened are knowledgeable and pertinent. In some cases it was possible within the time-budget limits of this survey to obtain inputs from a few other local community agencies that dealt with given E & D projects. It might indeed be valuable to conduct a deeper study in a few cities to trace the impact and perceptions in depth regarding certain projects, interviewing a representative sample of the project's ex-clients as well as all the relevant community agencies. Incidentally, the impacts reported in this study are only those which have been recognized and mentioned, and in some instances documented. There are and were other impacts or influences made by these projects which no one ever documented or mentioned, and in some cases will not be immediately visible. For example, the National Association of Manufacturers and many local Chambers of Commerce have called upon the heads of business organizations to hire and train previously untrained and unskilled persons. This involvement by the private sector in the war on poverty has been stimulated greatly by the federal War on Poverty, and is now picking up momentum.

## II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

OMPER provided the authors with the final reports, selected periodic reports, copies of various supplementary articles and materials on each of approximately 50 E & D youth projects conducted during the period 1963 - 1966 and selected as appropriate for this survey. In addition, OMPER provided copies of a variety of Department of Labor publications relevant to the E & D projects. These were carefully reviewed to gain an overview of the policies and operations of OMPER, the goals, activities and findings of each E & D project, and the nature of impact made by the projects on relevant agencies and institutions. Following this initial review, a week-long visit was made to OMPER's Washington headquarters where mutual determination was made of projects to be visited. Individual projects were selected to reflect a range of geographical locations, community and institutional settings, types of sponsoring agencies, project techniques and potential impact areas. OMPER contacted the selected project directors, introduced the present study and arranged for specific appointments for site visits.

Prior to each site visit, reports and other materials relevant to the given project were carefully reviewed, and areas of actual and potential impact noted. In each instance the project director was interviewed for two or more hours. In most cases other project staff members either participated in the interview with the director or were seen at a later time. In a few instances it was possible to hold a personal or telephone interview, usually brief, with representatives of potential "user" agencies and institutions.

The interviews with project staff were semi-structured. In each instance the nature of the present study was described and the project staff member was encouraged spontaneously to relate examples of success or failure of impact together with his perceptions of the methods used and the reasons for the success or failure of impact in each area. The staff member was then asked to discuss project impact, actual and potential, in terms of specific national, state and local levels. On the national level, particular attention was given to impact on federal legislation, policies and operations of the Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (especially the Office of Education), Office of Economic Opportunity, Department of Defense, and the Civil Service Commission. Impact on nation-wide employers and unions was also explored. At the state level, impact on legislation, and the state departments of employment, education, corrections, and rehabilitation were discussed. At the local level, explorations were made of the impact on private youth-serving agencies, local Employment Services offices and Youth Opportunities Centers, public schools, local labor unions, employers, welfare agencies, correction institutions, and the courts. The local community action "poverty programs," particularly those in the youth and manpower areas, were discussed as a major area of potential impact. These examples are intended to be illustrative. The presence and absence of specific project impact at the national, state or local level will be described in detail later in this paper.

Following the site visits, the interview material was carefully reviewed and collated with the project reports, and other available documents and findings were organized as presented in the following section. The author's focus was to seek evidence regarding impact on agencies and institutions that might be expected to benefit from what was done and learned by the E & D projects. We have classified these benefit-receivers or potential consumers of E & D project findings as follows:

A. Local and State Level (including local offices of state agencies)
    1. Public Sector:
        a. Local Employment Service Offices
        b. Public Schools and State and Local Vocational Education Agencies
        c. Law Enforcement Agencies, Courts, Correction Agencies
        d. Anti-poverty Programs
        e. Health and Welfare Agencies
        f. Public Employers
    2. Private Sector:
        a. Employers and Local Chambers of Commerce
        b. Labor Unions
        c. Youth-serving Private Agencies
        d. Private Educational Organizations

B. National Level
    1. Public Sector:
        a. Department of Labor (BES, BAT, OMPER, NYC)
        b. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (USOE, NIH, NIMH, etc.)
        c. Office of Economic Opportunity (CAP, Job Corps)
        d. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
    2. Private Sector:
        a. Employers Associations
        b. National or International Unions
        c. National Organizations Serving Youth

## III. FINDINGS

Data from the foregoing sources with reference to impact claimed in terms of cooperation provided and dissemination and utilization of E & D project findings are herewith presented.

### A. Local and State Levels

#### 1. Public Sector:

##### a. Local Employment Service Offices (Including Youth Opportunities Centers)

Many projects, under the terms of their contracts with OMPER, were dependent upon the Employment Service for such key functions as trainee recruitment, screening, testing, counseling and/or placement in jobs or skill training. The Employment Service was also responsible for taking the initial actions (preparation of MT-1 and MT-2) for establishing occupational training for clients in E & D projects. These vital services were frequently difficult to arrange, hard to coordinate with other E & D project functions and often inadequate in timing, quality and sensitivity to the needs of disadvantaged youth.

In many cases, Employment Service officials saw the E & D projects as interlopers trying to do a job which was the rightful province of the Employment Service, had it been given adequate funds and personnel. Employment Service officials were frequently described by project personnel as acting as if the very existence of the E & D youth projects were an implicit or even explicit criticism of their ability to meet employability needs of youth, and accordingly often reacted with defensiveness and even hostility. Many project directors felt that the frequently observed tardy or half-hearted Employment Service performance of screening, placement, and other functions, justified by ES on the basis of inadequate funding and personnel, were in actuality a reflection of these defensive and hostile attitudes. Although ES did cooperate because they had to, the quality and quantity of service varied from place to place.

Where close cooperation did exist between the E & D projects and local Employment Service, this was generally felt by project staff to be a function of mutual respect and close interpersonal relationships between project staff and unusually enlightened, innovative, and progressive individual Employment Service officials. Except in the relatively few instances where this type of cooperation existed, most project directors felt that the ES did not cooperate to achieve the most effective service to youth.

On the brighter side, many Employment Service counselors, as in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Chicago and North Richmond, California, gained valuable insights and experiences necessary to work effectively with disadvantaged youth. This came about when they were given reduced case loads in order more effectively to serve youth either on detached assignment within the project or in local offices performing services for the project (i.e., selection, testing, placement). Upon termination of these special assignments, the counselors involved either returned to their regular roles in ES, or left to work in other poverty programs, or assumed important roles in the YOC.

It is important to note that the project reports and staff interview materials revealed no instances of _direct local_ adoption by the State Employment Service of new knowledge, innovative methods and procedures, or other presumably useful findings stemming from the E & D projects. Only one project director among those interviewed spontaneously mentioned the issue of ES utilization of E & D findings. In almost all instances, they tended to think in terms of securing and maintaining the necessary cooperation to carry out the project, rather than in terms of the Employment Service adapting or adopting any of the project's findings. The project directors generally felt that the dissemination aspect of impact had been reasonably well served in that the Employment Service local offices and officials with which the project had direct contact were well informed of project goals and results. However, the widespread utilization of E & D experiences and findings came, when it did come, by a more circuitous route -- the planning, funding, and creation of the State ES Youth Opportunity Centers, instigated at the _federal_ (BES) level. This important instance of E & D project impact will be discussed later in the appropriate section.

The E & D youth projects served well in the "gadfly" role of reminding the Employment Services of the existence of large numbers of out-of-school, out-of-work youths whose needs were either unmet or inadequately met. The E & D projects also forcefully brought to the attention of these agencies the fact that the so-called disadvantaged youth could be reached, recruited, counseled, trained, and employed with considerable success when the proper resources, attitudes, and methods were marshaled and applied.

One E & D project, that at Hunter's Point in San Francisco, was transformed into a permanent Youth Opportunity Center of the USES. Unfortunately, staff and management turnover both in the E & D project itself, and later in the YOC, diluted the amount of carry-over of innovations and experiences. This fact notwithstanding, the project, which included Employment Service personnel during its E & D phase, was able to provide a reasonable degree of basic experience and continuity of services, thus sparing this Center some of the more acute growing pains and trial and error activities experienced by other Centers.

Unfortunately, much of the knowledge accumulated by the E & D youth projects was either not available to or used by many of the YOCs. A former director of an early E & D project had the opportunity to visit a number of YOCs in the same state where the project existed. He was chagrined and dismayed to repeatedly find the same naivete, uncertainty about methods and approaches, and inadequate planning and/or funding for necessary services which had characterized the early stages of the E & D project more than three years previously. This fact is made even more disturbing when one considers that the overall funding agency, the U.S. Department of Labor, was the same for both the E & D project and the Youth Opportunities Center. In addition, the same State Employment Service was intimately involved in both the E & D and YOC operations. This is a clear demonstration of the failure to utilize painfully acquired knowledge and experience within the same Federal and State agencies. Based on the reports and interview data for this study, it is clear that this costly breakdown in communication, coordination, and effective utilization is a nationwide phenomenon.

### b. Public Schools and State and Local Vocational Education Agencies

The perceptions and reports of the E & D project directors largely tell a similar story with reference to the project's impact on public schools and vocational education and training. Under MDTA, the planning, staffing, and operation of institutional training programs were the legal responsibility of one or another combination of state and local boards of education and their respective vocational education components. Those institutions which had direct training responsibilities to or other direct relationships with the

E & D projects tended to become well aware of their nature, mission, and orientation during the course of the project's life. Despite that, there was often only the most limited cooperation between projects and school systems. Although there were widespread affirmations of support for the innovative, youth-oriented goals of the E & D projects from spokesmen for state and local boards of education, implementation of this support on the operating level, in most instances, was at best grudging, and at worst nearly nonexistent. Noteworthy exceptions to this generalization did exist, for example, in the Chicago JOBS project. In instances of active, creative cooperation on the part of school administrators, the important ingredient appears to have been a pre-existing personal commitment and openness to innovation and lack of defensiveness on the part of individuals.

In many instances state and local school systems and officials had a negative impact on the E & D projects rather than the projects having a positive or innovative impact on education. This negative impact was perhaps most serious in the area of project-related MDTA institutional training. Institutional training programs were developed with rigid, bureaucratic adherence to the standards for admission, curriculum content and regulations for student deportment and attendance characteristic of regular MDTA training, though it was evident to most E & D project personnel that the standard MDTA training was clearly inappropriate for the vast majority of disadvantaged youth which the projects were philosophically and contractually committed to serve. Even when these guidelines were broadened at the request of many E & D projects to meet the needs of special youth projects, only belated and grudging modification of curriculum, regulations, and attitudes was forthcoming from many local educators. What could have been an almost ideal laboratory for vocational educators to discover the needs of disadvantaged youth and develop new attitudes, flexibility, and innovations in methods, techniques, and curriculum, became, too often, an overt or covert battleground between projects and schools, where the trainee was too often defeated.

When, in response to urgent recommendations by the E & D projects, remedial or basic skills training was authorized by law as a component of MDTA in institutional training, another opportunity for major impact on the training of the disadvantaged was presented. All too often this opportunity was largely dissipated. The E & D project soon discovered that the curricula, tools, methods, and attitudes necessary to teach basic skills to disadvantaged youth were either lacking or only marginally helpful. Further, in spite of a long history of attempts to educate the disadvantaged, little research had been done and little effective knowledge had been developed or was made available for use in the E & D project-related institutional training.

The E & D projects clearly pointed up the lack of special-purpose educative and training methods, techniques, and attitudes for use with the disadvantaged. These revelations, however, were frequently met with massive defensiveness on the part of educators, together with the denial for responsibility for solutions to the problems. The disadvantaged or the projects were blamed for the lack of success of traditional methods. On the other hand, it must be said that the knowledge gained through bitter experience by the E & D projects concerning the lack of appropriate tools to teach and train the disadvantaged did have the effect, when reported and publicized, of at least temporarily disturbing the widespread complacency present in educational circles. Detroit is an example of where well-based criticism subsequently led to improved and relatively effective training programs in that city.

On the positive side, there were widespread instances of active cooperation on the part of public schools and educators (New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Detroit). These consisted of the provision of teachers and classroom space, and materials for basic skills training of the disadvantaged at no cost to the project. They also included instances of regularized referral of dropouts or potential dropouts to E & D projects for the purposes of encouraging them to remain in school. When this proved impossible, they were assisted in receiving training, counseling, and employment. Many individual schools gave special consideration to E & D project trainees who had been motivated to return to continue their formal education. In addition, many teachers and counselors assigned to or working with the E & D showed a high level of dedication and competence, and presumably used their increased experience and understanding to good effect when they returned to more traditional roles and settings in the schools.

Some of the E & D youth projects had as sole or major sponsor the local board of education; for others, contacts with local schools were provided through common involvement in MDTA institutional training; still others had no formal school contact and conducted their own training or provided for it through other channels. It is important to note that, from our data, projects with full or partial school board sponsorship had no more lasting impact on educational policy, curriculum, methods, or attitudes than did those not so sponsored. The one result of full or partial school board sponsorship appears to be continued exposure to the issues and problems of training. However, it is not clear what, if any, long-term impact this exposure has had. One project, almost entirely staffed by school personnel, reported that the project staff were received and treated as outcasts or rebels who annoyingly rocked the traditional educational "boat." Many of the non-school sponsored projects reported having been perceived and treated similarly by the regular educational establishment.

On an overall basis, the direct utilization of E & D youth project findings by local and state educational institutions appears to have been minimal, but the indirect stimulation may be considerable.

c. Law Enforcement Agencies, Courts, and Correction Agencies

The major impact of the E & D youth projects in this area has been the encouragement and facilitation of the enlightened philosophy of retaining juvenile offenders in their home community and providing various training and rehabilitation services rather than incarcerating them. Police departments, courts, and probation and parole departments have provided a substantial number of trainee referrals for E & D project services, which in many cases were previously nonexistent. Our evidence indicates that in many cases the E & D referral has been used in lieu of the sentencing or commitment of the youth to a detention facility. The indications are that this referral choice, often tested in the E & D projects, is being extended to other more permanent community-based youth and manpower programs which have recently followed the E & D projects into operation as a consequence of the Economic Opportunity Act and other enabling legislation.

There are indications, for example, that Los Angeles County was able to close two probation forestry camps because of the marked decrease in youth commitments from the two major areas served by E & D projects. While firm evidence is lacking for a decrease in juvenile crime in areas served by the E & D projects or their successors, considerable anecdotal material in the reports and interviews suggests that this is probable. If a detailed study of this matter would bear out present indications, then, indeed, large scale training and employment opportunities offered through permanent institutions providing services similar to those developed and tested by the E & D projects could have far-reaching societal benefits by providing a viable alternative to crime for disadvantaged youth.

An E & D project in a correctional setting in Alabama has had a high degree of success in training inmates in an institutional setting and placing them in employment in the community. They have been flooded with requests for reports, information, and visits from literally all over the world. OMPER is in process of sponsoring conferences and written material to help promote utilization of what has been demonstrated through this project.

On an overall basis, rapport and sharing of information between E & D projects and those agencies responsible for the rehabilitation of youthful offenders has been very good.

d. Anti-Poverty Programs

The impact of the E & D youth programs on the local anti-poverty programs has been considerable. Perhaps the major source of impact has been the large pool of trained and experienced professional manpower represented by the staffs of the E & D projects. All over the United States on local, state, and federal levels, E & D staff members have taken positions of high responsibility at both policy-making and operational levels in the vastly expanded programs for the disadvantaged carried out on a regular rather than a demonstration basis. Their contribution has been enormous, particularly in the youth and manpower program areas, although it has been by no means limited to this area. E & D project personnel have taken high administrative positions, for example, in the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, and in the OEO community action programs. These E & D staff members, with on-the-job training and experience, are providing a more than welcome offset to the serious shortage of experienced professionals in the various programs serving the disadvantaged. These personnel have brought with them the techniques, methods, concepts, and innovations developed over a period of several years on smaller, comparatively laboratory-like E & D projects.

Probably the second most important area of E & D impact has been the continuation of ongoing E & D projects, often in an expanded form with increased resources on a regular rather than demonstration basis and utilizing OEO and BES funds. These projects are directly able to use their hard-won knowledge and experience in rapidly providing the high level of manpower services to youth without the agonizing "tooling up" and trial-and-error periods common to other new programs. (See Appendix B for a list of projects "spun off" to be funded by other agencies.)

A related source of impact has been the widespread employment of E & D staff members in writing proposals for anti-poverty programs embodying a wider variety and closer integration of services to the disadvantaged. The need for these services was almost universally recognized through E & D experience but fell short of implementation because of lack of prior enabling legislation. For example, E & D project experiences pointed up the need for comprehensive, readily available services beyond training and counseling to prepare the disadvantaged for employment. Medical, dental, and optometric screening and treatment, remedial and basic skills education, supervised work experience, and other services were not available under MDTA or other legislation. However, the need was recognized and written into the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, MDTA amendments and other legislation as a result of the E & D experience.

In many instances the Neighborhood Youth Corps benefited from prior E & D efforts and innovations in the area of work experience for disadvantaged youth. The efficacy of using work-crews at work training situations, an integral part of today's regular NYC program, was first shown in E & D projects in New York City and New Haven, Connecticut.

To cite another major source of impact in the anti-poverty area, in a number of the nation's largest cities a sponsoring agency of an E & D youth project became, in effect, the overall anti-poverty agency for those cities (Los Angeles, Boston, and New Haven). In St. Louis, Missouri, the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service, the sponsoring agency of an E & D project, was given responsibility for the planning and administration of that city's greatly enlarged anti-poverty manpower programs. The selection of these agencies for such an expanded and significant role rested in large part on their successful experience as sponsors and administrators of E & D projects.

A major by-product of the massive involvement on the part of E & D staffs and sponsoring agencies in the anti-poverty programs has been the large-scale infusion into the anti-poverty programs of the dedication, courage, flexibility and boldly imaginative and innovative spirit of these agencies and individuals. By contrast, many anti-poverty staff members coming from the comfortable and complacent slot in an established agency and institution reflect, in many cases, quite the opposite: a rigid preoccupation with the most limited and restrictive interpretations of policies and possibilities, the lack of creative ideas and imagination, a stubborn reliance on inappropriate and ineffective if traditional methods, and disturbing lack of awareness of or commitment to the whole spirit and thrust of the anti-poverty program.

e. Health and Welfare Agencies

A sizable percentage of E & D project referrals came from welfare workers who referred members of welfare-dependent families for training and employment. While it was found that many public health and welfare agencies cooperated closely with the E & D youth projects in providing special services to project youth (e.g., Chicago and Detroit projects), this usually did not result in policy and organizational changes geared to providing services to disadvantaged youth on an ongoing basis beyond the life of the project.

The cooperating public health agencies helped demonstrate clearly that large numbers of disadvantaged youth were seriously hampered in their training and employment efforts due to health problems. The services that were provided (medical, dental, optometric, psychiatric) emerged from the close working relationships between individuals in the respective agencies, and were not institutionalized. The public health agencies were in need of expanded funds, staffing and facilities in order to provide badly needed services to youth on a regular and sustained basis. The

MDTA amendments of 1966 provided for medical costs up to $100 for persons selected or eligible to be selected for training.

In the early months of the E & D project operations, training allowances paid to project enrollees were frequently deducted from family allowances provided to trainees'families by local welfare departments. This policy had the effect of redistributing rather than increasing the family's income. In effect it guaranteed the trainee a percentage of the family's overall income. Many parents resented this reduction in their income and put pressure on trainees to withdraw from training. Gradually, after much discussion and negotiation, legislative and policy changes were generally made so that local welfare departments no longer deducted MDTA training allowance payments from moneys received by the families of trainees.

### f. Public Employers

A substantial number of the E & D youth projects gained valuable experience in utilizing the inherent skills and abilities of the disadvantaged in their own behalf as project aides, assistants, tutors, and community workers. This demonstration of the successful use of indigenous workers contributed to their subsequent widespread utilization in the anti-poverty programs.

Except for the subsidized employment of individuals in local public agencies under the various work experience and work study programs, the E & D projects appeared to have had little or no impact on the more traditional local civil service structure. It is sadly ironic that while local and state governmental bodies spend many millions of dollars in rehabilitation efforts directed toward various disadvantaged groups, these same bodies seldom themselves offer permanent employment opportunities to those deemed rehabilitated.

State and local civil service commissions and personnel boards have, in the main, not seen fit to reexamine their entry level requirements in the light of actual job requirements. They generally have not created new job categories or sub-professional roles for the disadvantaged except when specified under various federally financed programs, e.g., War on Poverty programs administered by local public agencies.

While the federal civil service has dropped the requirement that applicants list juvenile offenses on federal employment applications, following E & D inspired OMPER recommendations, very few state or local civil service commissions have taken this step. Two relevant pilot developments, however, have grown out of E & D experience: in San Francisco, federal agencies hired 1,000 disadvantaged people without regard for civil service requirements; 600 of these 1,000 are being trained with E & D funds to pass examinations to make their jobs permanent; 400 became permanent employees without having to pass exams. The federal agencies involved have advised the President's Committee on Manpower that these people, on the whole, are performing satisfactorily.

In New Jersey, state civil service requirements have been modified greatly so that tests relate directly to the job to be performed; e.g., the Newark Housing Authority has been able to hire about 75 painter apprentices, all of them disadvantaged, who qualified by climbing a scaffold, reading the label on a paint can, and demonstrating ability to learn a simple operation. This is an outcome of the NILE E & D project.

* * *

At the local and state levels, impact of E & D projects ranged from minimal to excellent. In the areas of employment services and educational agencies, attitudes of defensiveness and entrenched methods of carrying on operations served as barriers to impact. Public employers conspicuously failed to follow through in making permanent employment available to disadvantaged youths. On the other hand, the impact of the projects on law enforcement and correctional agencies was positive, and local anti-poverty programs derived major reenforcement from project trained professional personnel and from project operating experience.

2. Private Sector:

a. Employers and Local Chambers of Commerce

According to the evidence available, the impact of the E & D youth projects on employers has been extensive. First-hand, face-to-face contact between employers and project staff members (particularly those with job development responsibilities) has provided the opportunity to dissipate or weaken many negative stereotypes held by employers concerning disadvantaged youth. For many employers, the E & D projects provided their first experience with the employment of minority group members and others who because of limitation of education and attitudes had been considered unemployable. For example, the JOBS project in Chicago received declarations of interest to hire project graduates from numerous members of a large employers' association. The Detroit E & D project was able to place Negro youth in retail sales jobs in all-white suburbs for the first time.

Many employers have been persuaded through contact with project personnel and through subsequent experience to modify unrealistic job entrance requirements and re-examine their entry level jobs to determine the actual skill requirements. Most projects, for example, report that some employers dropped high school graduation as a prerequisite to employing project graduates, and that these changes came about as a consequence of face-to-face persuasive efforts by local E & D project personnel.

Some employers, too, have reconsidered previously rigid requirements that employees be free of any prior criminal record. Some employers agreed to discount any and all juvenile records when considering an applicant for employment. Others agreed to consider the nature of the offense in relation to the type of work anticipated, or to differentiate between minor and major offenses in considering persons for employment. These findings were reported by almost all projects but the overall incidence of employers modifying their arrest record policies was low. Frequently anticipated bonding problems were given as a reason for excluding those with records. Recent amendments to MDTA providing federal guarantees against employer loss help to overcome this problem. MDTA funds are available to purchase bonding coverage for prospective employees who are considered too great a risk for regular bonding companies. This has helped many employers to relax their fears of hiring people with criminal records.

Many employers extended employment opportunities to disadvantaged youth based on confidence in the employability preparation services performed by the project. Some employers would continue to hire members of disadvantaged and minority groups only if they came recommended by an agency performing pre-employment services similar to those of the E & D projects. Other employers are reported to have opened their doors more widely to disadvantaged youth regardless of the source of their referral.

Meaningful, catalytic contacts between projects and employers have paid off in altered employer-attitudes. For example, the Los Angeles E & D projects brought a number of employers into contact with minority group youth on project premises where the youth were at ease and articulate, a new experience for many employers. Many employers became more amenable to hiring project graduates when they were aware of the supportive pre and post employment services provided by the projects. (Project reports from Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, among others.) In Chicago, as in other areas, project staff acted as a communications bridge between employers and newly-employed project youth until employer-employee relationships were firmly established. E & D projects have developed means of assisting employers in complying with both the spirit and letter of regulations established under recent equal employment opportunity legislation. Neighborhood House in North Richmond, California, for example, provides project graduates an introduction to employers required to comply with equal opportunity provisions and encourages employer compliance through providing qualified applicants.

The provisions of the Manpower Training and Development Act enabling the funding of on-the-job training have proved to be a mixed blessing in implementation. For many months the policies and guidelines under which OJT contracts could be negotiated and carried out were unclear both to E & D project personnel and to Bureau of Apprenticeship Training representatives whose approval was necessary prior to the signing of an OJT contract with a prospective employer. Even when these guidelines and policies were clarified somewhat, employer resistance continued in many instances because of generalized employer fears of government supervision or control over any aspect of the operation of their business. In addition, many employers were wary of the anticipated volume of paperwork required to obtain modest remuneration for training efforts. As guidelines for OJT contracts were clarified and contracts could be rapidly developed and implemented, the E & D project role as subcontractor or "middleman" between the government and private business increasingly reduced fears of government control since employers dealt with project staffs on a person-to-person basis rather than with, to them, an ominous, distant bureaucracy. Large employers, as a rule, preferred to accept youth directly into their own ongoing training programs rather than contract for OJT. Some project staff members felt, however, that the very possibility of OJT contracts served as a lever to encourage the acceptance by employers of disadvantaged youths into their own training programs. With some exceptions, OJT contracts tended to be negotiated with small, nonunion employers to whom contract remuneration was more significant.

Many E & D project staff members observed that, strictly speaking, OJT contracts resulted in subsidized employment rather than on-the-job training beyond that received by any new employee on any job. That is, the employer frequently did not provide any more instruction or supervision than he would if he had hired an individual directly without benefit of OJT contract. Nonetheless, project personnel saw considerable value in OJT contracts as an incentive, at least to small employers, to employ the disadvantaged. Many employers did hire successful trainees. OJT provided a low-risk method of screening potential employees in the actual job situation.

E & D projects were much less successful in helping to develop new job classifications or categories which could be filled by disadvantaged youth than they were in finding and helping to fill existing jobs. This seems to be a function of both the pressure brought by job development staff to find openings quickly for project youth and the general lack of experience developing entirely new jobs in the labor market. The time required to find the pre-existing job is considerably less than that involved in creating a new one.

### b. Labor Unions

In general, the E & D project staffs expressed disappointment and disillusionment with their relative lack of success in securing union cooperation and participation in their efforts. The resistance to changes in long-standing attitudes, policies and procedures and the existence of a negative stereotype of disadvantaged youth were similar in kind and degree to those encountered in other public and private agencies and institutions. Lack of active cooperation and participation on the part of organized labor in fulfilling the training goals of the E & D projects can be attributed to a number of factors. Many union leaders viewed the entire MDTA program as implicitly anti-labor in that, they felt, it tended to train people in occupations where jobs did not exist and to result in the breaking up of apprenticeable occupations. It was feared that accepting less qualified entrants in apprenticeable trades would result in lowering of the standards of the trade and of the overall skill of its members.

In spite of these problems, there were instances of positive E & D impact on union attitudes toward and acceptance of disadvantaged youth. Perhaps the major area of impact has been that of the youth employment project of the National Institute of Labor Education. This project, despite many delays, disappointments and difficulties, was able to institute a number of model union-sponsored, MDTA-funded, pre-apprentice training programs. Typically, these programs combined institutional and on-the-job training. Many trainees who completed the experimental pre-apprenticeship programs were able to enter the regular apprenticeship program. Standards for admission into apprenticeship were not appreciably modified. The focus here was to utilize the pre-apprenticeship period to help the youth meet existing standards, thus upgrading his qualifications while maintaining the high standards of the apprenticeable trade. There is no doubt that the NILE trainees would never have been able to enter the formal apprenticeship without the pre-apprenticeship experience, which is now being copied in a number of cities.

E & D projects in Detroit, Chicago, Cincinnati, New York City, and St. Louis, among other cities, were successful in opening union membership to minority group disadvantaged youth for the first time. In most instances, this was accomplished through the inclusion of union officials in one or more of the following aspects of the E & D projects: planning, policy-making, or operations. For example, in New York City a seamen's union for the first time accepted disadvantaged Negro youths. In Cincinnati, journeymen from some of the building trades supervised work crews composed of disadvantaged youths engaged in the rehabilitation of substandard dwellings. In Alabama, the Barbers Union accepted prison-trained ex-inmates on a regular basis for the first time. In Chicago, an E & D project worked with the Teamsters Union to set up a youth training program including basic skills. On successful completion, the Union placed the trainees.

c. Youth-serving Private Agencies

Since traditional private agencies generally have their roles well established historically, and their budgets limit major program expansion, the impact of the E & D projects in terms of changes in the policies, procedures, and methods of private youth-serving agencies is limited. However, cooperation and mutual referrals between E & D projects and these agencies was very good, once a working relationship was established.

Many youth-serving agencies provided a neighborhood-based source of appropriate referrals of disadvantaged youth to the E & D projects. Many private agencies conducted programs and provided services to E & D project youth which were unavailable under Department of Labor funding. These included recreational programs, additional specialized counseling and therapeutic services, and, in some instances, specialized training and sheltered workshop placements.

A sizable number of E & D project sponsors were pre-existing youth-serving agencies. These included, for example, the YMCA in New York and Chicago, the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service in Philadelphia and St. Louis, the Neighborhood House in North Richmond, California, and National Committee on Children and Youth in Washington, D.C. OMPER funding enabled these agencies to utilize their past experience in working with youth to good effect in the area of youth counseling, training and employment. This funding enabled the private agencies to develop and carry out broad youth manpower services which their own limited resources would have precluded. The E & D project experience of these agencies, in turn, enabled them to take an experienced and even more expanded role in the anti-poverty programs under the Economic Opportunity Act and other enabling legislation. The JEVS in St. Louis now administers all manpower programs of the local community action agency.

d. Private Educational Organizations

Another area of E & D impact has been in providing settings for private educational firms to develop programed instruction materials to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth. One firm developed materials for a combined program of basic skills and automobile mechanic training in cooperation with an E & D project sponsored by the YMCA in Brooklyn, New York. These materials were later picked up and used as the major training component of a plan by a national automobile dealers association to train disadvantaged youth on a large scale. A private educational research firm now providing programed instructional materials for the Job Corps gained considerable initial experience and opportunity to pretest instructional materials for disadvantaged youth in an E & D Project. Thus, in at least two cases, educational systems firms gained pilot experience for a major later contribution in the context of an E & D project.

* * * *

The E & D projects have provided a major beginning in bringing disadvantaged and minority group youth into productive contact, often for the first time, with numerous private employers and labor unions. Many private youth-serving agencies have increased their capabilities to undertake an even greater youth-serving role under the Economic Opportunity Act and other recent human development legislation. A number of private educational research firms have gained large-scale practical experience for the later broader application of programed instruction to the educational and training needs of the disadvantaged.

## B. National Level

### 1. Public Sector:

#### a. Department of Labor (BES, BAT, OMPER, NYC)

The experiences of the E & D youth projects have had major impact on the conception and planning of, and the guidelines and procedures for the Youth Opportunity Centers. While these Centers are operated by the Employment Services of the various states, the Bureau of Employment Security has established the guidelines for their organization and operation. The overall concept of providing intensive manpower services to disadvantaged youth near their places of residence was implemented on a major scale for the first time in the E & D projects. It was successfully demonstrated that this approach could be effective in reaching recruiting, training and placing disadvantaged youth.

The necessity for and value of intensified ongoing counseling services to the disadvantaged was amply demonstrated. Similarly, group counseling, with its advantages of peer interaction and more effective use of professional counseling manpower, was given wide try-out in the E & D projects and has since become a reasonably well-established technique within the Youth Opportunity Centers.

In the area of job development, E & D experience unmistakably pointed up the necessity for a more client-centered approach. The traditional reliance on meeting the needs primarily of employers resulted in a paucity of jobs for disadvantaged youth. A more comprehensive approach is based on a realistic assessment of the needs and qualifications of these young people followed by an attempt to find or develop jobs appropriate to the youth rather than the prior focus on finding youth appropriate to the jobs available. This E & D concept is now seen in the recent BES "Human Resources Development" program, which extends the same client-oriented approach to adults and is required to be set up by every State ES. The HRD program will provide:

(1) Neighborhood outreach through mobile teams of ES personnel.

(2) Employability services which shall include interviewing, counseling, testing, referral, placement and follow-up.

Employability services will be enhanced by the provision of services developed and offered cooperatively with resources for education, health, rehabilitation, housing, legal aid, child care services, and any other service organization or community resource which may improve employability of the individual. Any individual who is reached and served in this program may be referred to employment at any point in the process when he is ready for employment in line with his training and abilities. HRD programs have been initiated on an experimental and demonstration basis in Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, St. Louis and Rochester. State ES agencies are being encouraged to carry out this program through existing local employment service offices, including use of space in YOCs.

E & D experience further showed that a large number of out-of-school, out-of-work youth were unqualified for almost any job. This pointed up the need for training programs which would meet their actual level of qualification and work readiness, and develop their attitudes and skills to those required for entry-level jobs. The prior approach to training had been and, in too many cases, remains, the exclusion of all youth who could not meet training requirements and norms established on the basis of qualifications of other, non-disadvantaged populations. Discovery that the majority of disadvantaged youth were not ready for job-training programs led to the realization that both supervised and sheltered work experience, and basic communication skills and employability training, sometimes alone and sometimes in combination with skill training, were urgently needed before youth could productively participate in more formal occupational training or could perform adequately in entry-level occupations once jobs were secured.

It was apparent that communication skills and other prevocational training should not be invariably linked to institutional or OJT. Some youth require all services; others require only certain types or levels of training. Amendments to MDTA incorporated this E & D-derived knowledge. E & D experience further taught that comprehensive health services, including medical, dental, optometric, and psychiatric, needed to be readily available to disadvantaged youth if their trainability and employability were not to be severely handicapped. These E & D experiences can be directly linked to legislative amendments to the MDTA which established programs for communication skills and health services.

E & D project results validated the hypothesis that staffing patterns could profitably include nonprofessionals from the community to be served who could assist in reaching and involving disadvantaged youth and the community at large in manpower programs. The BES Project CAUSE (Counselor Aide University Summer Education) made direct use of the E & D pattern of using counselor aides to bridge the gap between the counselor and client and supplement the short supply of available counselors.

An equally important finding from the E & D projects is that the aforementioned services must be carefully coordinated and readily available if dropouts and lack of follow-through on referrals are to be avoided. Ideally, these comprehensive services should be housed under one roof or in close, coordinated proximity to one another. This concept of coordination and ready availability of services falls far short of both the universal and the ideal in application and execution, but a strong beginning has been made as seen in the establishment of the YOC's and Neighborhood Employment Centers of the Community Action Program of OEO.

A major contact between the E & D projects and the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training (BAT) has been in the area of OJT. Initially, coordination and cooperation in the development and funding of OJT contracts suffered from a lack of clear policy guidelines and contract instructions. Considerable damage was done to relationships between projects and potential trainer-employers, since the latter felt that the paperwork required in both contract approval and payment were often seriously delayed. To further complicate the problem, many BAT staff members in local areas were less than enthusiastic about on-the-job training, or adopted a "business as usual" attitude more characteristic of slow-moving bureaucracies than of action programs. This resulted in instances of friction and further weakening of already tenuous communication. Closer communication between OMPER (previously OMAT) and BAT at the Washington level, and better communication between these agencies and the projects' field representatives, respectively, could have materially eased and speeded the implementation and impact of the on-the-job training program. Subsequently, progress was made in communication and coordination, resulting in increased OJT effectiveness.

Those projects reporting other types of contact with BAT staff at the Washington and local levels revealed general satisfaction with the former level and uneven experience at the latter level. Some project staffs' local representatives of BAT appeared, at least initially, uninformed and unenthusiastic about E & D project efforts to involve disadvantaged youth in apprenticeship programs. In many instances they reportedly found many reasons why involvement wasn't possible rather than making serious attempts to ease long-standing barriers. These examples serve to highlight the cost of inadequate intradepartmental coordination and commitment to departmental goals and policies.

As reported by the projects, the relationship between them and their funding agency, OMPER, has been excellent despite certain unfavorable existing circumstances. Particularly praised were the able, dedicated and overworked project officers who unstintingly facilitated the operation of the E & D projects. However, circumstances beyond the control of the project officers often mitigated against optimum project progress and impact. From the project's viewpoint, OMPER's program officers were burdened with the monitoring and supervision of too many projects and were assigned additional duties to the extent that overall efficiency was affected. The stresses and strains were manifest at the project level by difficulty in getting prompt attention to requests for contract modifications to meet changing or newly perceived project needs. Perhaps more serious was the delay and uncertainty in renegotiation of contracts. This materially affected the perceived job security of project staff members, which was not too good at best, and had a consequent effect on morale. Many projects were forced to operate on a week-to-week or month-to-month basis pending refunding. This inherent uncertainty and insecurity in turn affected the nature and extent of the commitments the projects were able to make to both trainees and cooperating agencies, such as schools, employers, and training programs. According to recent information from projects, shortages of OMPER program officers and uncertainties over sustained funding support still persist as bothersome problems to E & D project personnel.

The area of major impact has been the success of OMAT and its successor, OMPER, in broadening and modifying the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act through amendments based upon E & D project experiences. An early legislative change was the broadening of the availability of training allowances to cover participation in a wider variety of training activities and related necessary services. The period during which training allowances can be paid has been extended from one to two years. The amount of training allowance payment has been increased for certain categories of individuals, and transportation expenses are now provided to cover the cost of commuting to and from training sites. The use of group and individual trainee referrals to private educational and training facilities has been provided for, and the use of such facilities encouraged through modifying restrictions on their use. An amendment to MDTA provided for the funding of vitally needed pre-training medical examinations and limited health services. Pre-vocational communications and job-skills training not necessarily linked together are now available under MDTA. Institutional training paid for by the use of regular training funds can now be provided for prison inmates under MDTA. Bonding services for training program graduates are now available through an experimental project in 15 cities across the nation. These amendments were in direct response to the needs uncovered by the E & D projects. The E & D project experience at Draper and Lorton led Congress to amend the 1966 MDTA to permit and encourage the use of regular training funds for programs to be held in penal institutions.

The E & D youth projects have amply demonstrated the need for and feasibility of providing supervised, somewhat sheltered work experience for disadvantaged youth. The establishment and operation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is providing the paid work experience on a nationwide scale. E & D projects, notably that of Mobilization for Youth in New York City, were among the first to develop and test the work-crew concept so basic to the operations of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Further E & D refinements were suggested by later experience combining actual work experience with counseling and basic education training as part of the overall work experience program, and these are now being incorporated in regular NYC operations. Other refinements suggested by the experience of the City of Detroit's E & D project include the development of rotation of trainees through various work sites providing increasingly rigorous demands for performance of trainees as they move from station to station. This "graded work experience" provides variety of work experience and levels of ability and sophistication demanded to suit the needs of individual trainees at various stages of their development and learning. The E & D projects discovered that in order to be successful, work experience must be meaningful and productive. "Make work" types of activities tended to reduce rather than to increase trainee morale and motivation. Further demonstrated is the need for careful selection of NYC youth supervisors. In order not to defeat the purposes of work experience, supervisors need to be sensitively aware of the attitudes, needs, and values of the trainees. A lack of awareness in this area leads to conflict and, ultimately, mutual rejection and lack of benefit to the youth. In some areas NYC profited from these E & D findings; in others, these lessons were learned through painful experience.

b. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

(OE, NIH, NIMH, etc.)

For the most part E & D project impact on HEW has been difficult to measure. Project reports and interviews with OMPER and project staff members indicate relatively little direct contact between the projects and HEW.

The lack of impact of E & D experience on the Office of Education was partly a function of the absence of direct communication and the inadequacy of the communication between OMPER and OE. Perhaps it also was partly a function of failure to involve OE and local level educational institutions in the co-architectural support or sponsorship of those projects calling for a large education component. The establishment of the Interagency Project Review Committee has greatly improved this situation. Since established educational institutions at the local level are nearly immune to major impact from E & D or indeed many other types of local projects, the need for ready and direct communication between the projects and responsible agencies at the federal level is essential before it is likely to sift down to the local level. When the communication and the will to collaborate are weak, not only does impact fail in terms of instituting progressive and meaningful changes in the policies and operations of established institutions, but even the operations of the E & D projects may be retarded and eventual success limited.

The E & D projects clearly demonstrated the need for closely coordinated, readily available public and mental health services for disadvantaged youth. The increasing availability of neighborhood-based community public and mental health services are certainly a beginning toward meeting these needs, and federal aid to the states for these services derive in part from impact at the national level.

### c. Office of Economic Opportunity

In a very real sense, the E & D youth projects served as viable precursors to the programs now being carried out on a broad scale under the Economic Opportunity Act. At both the national and local levels, the innovations, experiences, and findings of the E & D projects were reflected in the design and operation of vastly expanded and increasingly comprehensive new programs. The staff members from the E & D projects formed trained and intensively experienced cadres utilized at the policy-making, planning, and operational levels of the large scale anti-poverty programs which began in 1964.

The one-stop, neighborhood-based, multi-service center, a concept now commonplace in the War on Poverty, found its first clear successful demonstration in the experiences of the E & D projects.

The successful utilization of non-professional volunteers in varied aspects of the E & D projects was embodied in many of the roles undertaken by volunteers in the VISTA program, the domestic version of the Peace Corps.

The Job Corps fulfills a need discovered and demonstrated in the E & D projects for the residential counseling, education, training and socialization of many youth where neighborhood influences and impoverished home environment made the fulfillment of these goals in the community difficult if not impossible. However, the findings of one E & D project, that operated by the New York City Youth Board, showed that disadvantaged youth could be successfully retained and trained in a camp setting where total enrollment was small enough to retain many aspects of a home-like rather than institutional atmosphere and where individual attention was facilitated.

It may well be that the substantial dropout rate and discipline problems experienced by the large Job Corps centers could be considerably reduced were the individual centers smaller and more individualized units. The question as to whether the perhaps inherently less economical smaller centers would in fact result in both greater economy of operation and better service to youth through a reduction in dropouts and discipline problems should be carefully examined by the Job Corps. Another area of E & D project experience of great potential benefit to the Job Corps is the need for carefully coordinated job development and placement as well as follow-up contact and counseling for individuals who have completed training. In spite of the demonstrated need, these placement and follow-up services are, as yet, not widely or easily available to Job Corps graduates, thus breaking the necessary link between training and employment.

d. Housing and Urban Development

An E & D project in Cincinnati has demonstrated that disadvantaged youth could gain valuable work experience and, in some cases, pre-apprenticeship training, in the building trades while helping to rehabilitate deteriorated homes under union journeyman supervision. OMPER and HUD have been collaborating in this area, and Cincinnati will be used as a model for expanding this procedure for trial in other communities. Neighborhood multi-service centers are being established by HUD in conjunction with the Model Cities program, and the need for such centers was demonstrated many times by various E & D projects.

2. Private Sector

a. Employers' Associations

Concrete evidence for E & D project impact on national associations of employers is shown in the previous reference to an E & D project which developed a programmed instruction training curriculum later included in a training program prepared by the National Automobile Dealers Association.

There is evidence that an appreciable number of local employers and employer groups belonging to a variety of national associations have been increasingly sensitized to the existence and needs of disadvantaged youth by way of E & D projects. Further, they have become increasingly aware that disadvantaged youth, given proper preparation and training, can make a substantial positive contribution to business and industry. Disadvantaged, minority group youth have, as a result, gained employment in fields of employment and occupations previously largely closed to them. These include the areas of banking, general clerical work, and retail sales. In several major cities, including St. Louis and Chicago, local chapters of national employer organizations have, in response to E & D project efforts, committed themselves to opening literally thousands of jobs to disadvantaged minority group members. The National Association of Manufacturers has taken a lead to demonstrate what the private sector can do to train the culturally disadvantaged through its STEP and MIND programs, demonstrated in New York and promoted in other cities. (See Newsweek, May 15, 1967.) These programs provide for manpower development, including basic education, skill training, motivation, and adoption of computer technology to match individuals of marginal skills to jobs or upgrading programs.

b. National and International Unions

Positive impact on the labor movement, where it has occurred, has been evident primarily at the local level. However, enlightened union leadership at the national level has been made increasingly aware of the existence and needs of disadvantaged youth, and a beginning has been made in devising ways in which organized labor can meaningfully participate in meeting these needs. The model coupled training programs leading to apprenticeship developed by the E & D youth employment project sponsored by the National Institute of Labor Education convincingly demonstrates feasibility of union sponsorship of training programs and provides realistic and practical guidelines for such sponsorship on a nationwide basis. The NILE project also clearly demonstrated that union cooperation and participation in manpower programs can be best solicited when the soliciting agencies staff, in this case the NILE E & D project staff, has had widespread experience in and knowledge of the labor movement. It is also highly important that labor representatives share in the planning and sponsorship of the operations of such an agency.

### c. National Organizations Serving Youth

Two national youth-serving organizations, the National Committee on Children and Youth and the National Committee on the Employment of Youth, have sponsored E & D youth projects. Their success demonstrates that private youth-serving agencies are able, given adequate resources, to mount significant efforts for greater employment of youth. Similarly, local branches or chapters of national organizations, i.e., YMCA, have mounted successful projects. By example, this has shown that youth-serving private agencies can, utilizing federal funding, make a major contribution, and indeed this contribution is now being made on a greatly expanded scale under the Economic Opportunity Act in which private agencies across the nation have vastly broadened their traditional role and scope of youth-serving activities, with particular emphasis on meeting the needs of the disadvantaged.

* * * * *

On the whole, specific E & D project impact on private national organizations has been limited to their local components, although an increased awareness of the characteristics and unmet needs of disadvantaged youth on the part of the national leadership of these organizations has been an example of generalized impact, and perhaps best illustrated by NAM taking a leadership role in this field.

## IV. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Although, as can be seen from the foregoing, the impact of the E & D youth projects has been considerable, it is the firm conviction of the authors that impact has been far less than optimal. In this section, the reasons for this conviction will be presented and discussed.

Apart from an interested ongoing agency being informed about the purpose, operation and findings of an E & D project, there are two general avenues that positive impact may take. The first, and the most widespread in the E & D projects, is cooperation through working relationships and, in many cases, interdependence between the E & D project and the regular local agency. The second general area of impact is dissemination and utilization of project findings. Problems arising in each of these areas are considered next.

### Cooperation

Efforts to secure cooperation from established agencies and institutions in areas served in the E & D projects have met with varying degrees of success. However, in a few instances where such efforts were to no avail, and in many instances where cooperation came only as a result of lengthy, painful, and sometimes even acrimonious negotiations, project operations were delayed and overall project effectiveness was in some cases seriously limited. Problems in cooperation stemmed from a variety of sources. For convenience, these sources can be subsumed and discussed under three categories: negative attitudes, insufficient resources, and inadequate pre-planning.

1. Negative Attitudes:

At the extreme, established agency staff members have expressed marked defensiveness and hostility toward the E & D projects, seeing them as brash interlopers in established agencies' areas of competence and operation. Some feel that the very existence of an E & D project is implied criticism of their past and current efforts. By these individuals, E & D projects are seen as a hostile, potentially dangerous and critical rival. On the other hand, E & D project staffs frequently characterize established agency personnel as being hopelessly enmeshed in and dedicated to their own bureaucracy at the expense of serving the needs of their presumed client populations. They are seen as looking backward, stubbornly clinging to traditional but inappropriate, even damaging, methods and approaches. They seem, from the project staff's viewpoint, too often to delight in finding reasons why something cannot be done rather than endeavoring to find ways of doing something. They cling tenaciously to the letter rather than to the spirit of policies and regulations in order to avoid change. Established agency personnel are seen as having no commitment toward rapid, active solutions to pressing problems but rather a dilatory, "business-as-usual," "there's no hurry," philosophy.

The above is in contrast to the sense of urgency experienced by most E & D staff members. Their zeal and enthusiasm to accomplish a great deal within the brief project life span have led to feelings of frustration, irritability, and even scorn, directed toward others less strongly motivated. The clash of these conflicting attitudes hardly facilitates quick and easy cooperation. In many instances, the frustration and impatience of the E & D staffs were exacerbated by contract provisions calling for being creative and innovative and at the same time requiring large numbers of youths to be served and training programs to be mounted which proved, in the light of later experience, to have been naive. Under these pressures, it was often difficult for E & D staff to pursue with their equanimity intact the often lengthy and circuitous paths toward interagency cooperation. In many instances where cooperation from other agencies was both lacking and vital to the success of the project, E & D staff members could not continue to muster the calm, patience, and objectivity necessary to elicit maximum positive response.

2. Insufficient Resources:

A further problem was presented in instances where potentially cooperative permanent agencies lacked adequate resources to carry out cooperative activities on the scale required by the needs of the project youth. Typically, shortages in space, equipment, and personnel limited to a token effort the cooperation many agencies could give, even though their willingness to cooperate was in many cases great. For example, the health services existing in the areas served by the E & D projects were typically overworked and over-extended even prior to the increased service needs revealed by the projects. Even though the projects often resulted in increased strains on already overburdened community services, they did serve to point out once again to those on a policymaking and funding level the need for vastly expanding services in a variety of major areas.

3. Inadequate Preplanning:

   The E & D projects usually had a bare minimum of time between gathering the staff and beginning to recruit youth for the projects. This lack of "lead time" made it difficult to pretrain and orient project staff to its own philosophy, methods, and goals and to establish cooperative relationships with outside agencies on which the project depended for success. Working relationships at the operating and management levels were still in the process of being painfully developed at a time when youth were literally clamoring at the project's door for training programs which could only be the end result of cooperation already established over a considerable period of time.

## Utilization

There seem to be several major obstacles in the path of optimum utilization of E & D findings and results.

1. Lack of Planning:

   First among these has been the lack of any but the most general type of planning for utilization, either at the time the proposal was written or during the discussions prior to its selection for funding. There seems to have been an implicit assumption on the part of the grantor and grantee alike that significant findings from a project will be adapted or adopted by potential "user" agencies if the findings are disseminated. Experience in the field of research utilization indicates that this is not generally the case. "Utilization is made, not born." In order to maximize the utilization of E & D project findings, there first must be an assignment of responsibility for effecting utilization. While this need has not been fully met, a most constructive attack on it was begun in July, 1966, by the establishment of OMPER's Division of Program Utilization in the Office of Special Manpower Programs.

2. Lack of Resources:

Adequate budget and staffing to carry out any utilization plans that might be formulated have been similarly lacking until recently. For these reasons, the considerable number of instances of utilization referred to above have come about in a somewhat haphazard fashion, and as the result of a fortuitous combination of project findings with outside agency needs. The intent here is not to deprecate these happy semi-accidents but to point out that utilization of project findings could doubtless have been more widespread had there been more careful planning and the employment of deliberate strategies at both the OMPER and project levels, which is now being done through the efforts of OMPER's new Division of Program Utilization.

3. Lack of Ongoing Evaluation:

Another problem area covered in greater detail in the Operation Retrieval chapter on Research is that of substantiation or validation of project findings. One factor influencing "user" agencies in adopting findings from an E & D project is the apparent validity of findings. Few of the E & D projects had a research component, as such, during their lifetime. Where evaluations of projects were conducted, they generally began after the project was well under way. A frequent result was that the projects did not have adequate ongoing feedback as to the quality and reliability of their data. As a consequence, the confidence with which E & D findings could be stated by the project or accepted by potential users was unnecessarily diluted.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered in the hope that they will, if adopted, result in markedly increased E & D impact.

### A. Responsibility for Impact

OMPER should, at the policy level, decide who at what level is responsible for planning and carrying out operations necessary to achieve project impact, including cooperation, dissemination, and utilization. Appropriate budget staffing and resources should be made available to insure that these responsibilities can be carried out effectively. OMPER may take the responsibility for project impact at the federal intra- and inter-agency, national and state levels, while the E & D projects may be given impact responsibility in terms of cooperation, dissemination, and utilization at the local level. OMPER's Division of Program Utilization in the Office of Special Manpower Programs now can provide the needed leadership to deal with the problems related to clarifying and achieving impact objectives. It might be helpful to establish guidelines which clearly state the scope and limits of impact responsibilities at various levels, together with suggested procedures for carrying out these responsibilities.

### B. Planning for Impact

The Division of Program Utilization already has undertaken some creative thinking about impact strategies. In a multi-agency seminar sponsored by OMPER in November, 1966, on "Putting Research, Experimental and Demonstration Findings to Use," many excellent ideas were discussed and brought together in a report. Some already have been implemented; e.g., a meeting was called by the Division of Adult Education Programs to pool information and plan activities to improve adult basic education. A very important deficiency in the project reports read in connection with this study was that the kinds of expected impact or action objectives were not defined and planned for from the inception of the project. The suggestions in the Multi-Agency Seminar Report referred to above spell out specific means for meeting this need -- from inception, throughout the project, and after the final report.

### C. Coordination, Cooperation and Communication for Impact

At least with reference to the completed E & D projects, it is clear that flaws and gaps in the lines of communication within the Department of Labor, as well as between the Department of Labor and other federal agencies with large commitments in the area of developing human resources, have been costly both in terms of project operations and project impact. Interagency rivalry, narrow agency self-interest, differential agency priorities, and in some cases the absence of regularized lines of communication, have contributed to this problem. Some constructive steps already have been taken, such as the establishment of an interagency review committee. Other steps have been suggested in the Multi-Agency Seminar Report. The communication need is a key, since it appears that one of the more important impact channels is from the local E & D project to OMPER, from OMPER to appropriate federal agencies within and without the Labor Department and back down to the local level, i.e., State Employment Services, schools, etc.

Two strategies that might help to reduce attitudinal resistances to new ideas and procedures derived from successful E & D projects, as well as help reduce communication gaps, are:

1. To draw up a system analysis of all the factors that bear importantly upon successful development, carry-through and dissemination-utilization of findings from an E & D project.
2. To invite key persons from all parts of the system to a conference in the role of consultants, to refine the analysis and advise on how to strengthen the weak parts. The hoped-for effect from this effort would not only be some good ideas, but some ego-involvement born of co-authorship in implementing those ideas.

Local E & D projects generally lack the permanence, authority and resources to effect lasting impact on the more powerful and entrenched agencies in the local area, at least under present circumstances. For these channels to work effectively, an improvement in OMPER program officer staffing is strongly indicated. OMPER program officers have been and continue to be seriously overburdened in the number of projects for which they have responsibility, as well as the sheer number and complexity of other duties they are required to perform. This situation often has resulted, according to reports obtained during field visits, in markedly delayed responsiveness to project needs, particularly in the area of budget modifications and refunding, and delays and blockages in the reception and transmission of important findings and insights emanating from the projects. Coordinated and careful planning has also been impeded in many instances. A realistic staffing plan is needed within OMPER which takes cognizance of the number and size of E & D projects in relation to the size of OMPER program staff. OMPER project officers need to have time to read periodic reports quickly and give appropriate and timely feedback to E & D project directors. Sufficient personnel to permit regular visits to projects would improve OMPER-E & D project communications and mutual understanding. Regular visits by key project staff to OMPER-Washington during which discussions with OMPER staff could be held would also increase meaningful communication.

In spite of the pitfalls frequently associated with federal-local relations, federal agencies operating in the human resources development area can have a powerful positive impact on their local counterparts in terms of introduction of new ideas, encouragement, stimulation, and funding which are beyond the capabilities of local E & D projects. Continued close personal contact (and collaboration where appropriate) at the Washington level among key persons in the research grants divisions, as well as the applied research, and program utilization offices of these agencies can facilitate E & D project impact at all levels. The November 28-29 seminar was an historic occasion partly because of its bringing together so many of these people in one room at the same time.

On the local E & D project level, substantially increased lead time should be given the projects to effectively include representatives of potential user and cooperating agencies in the general and detailed planning of project methods and operations. Following this, it is important that representatives of these agencies be intimately included in project planning and operation at middle management and line supervision levels. In many instances, commitments for close cooperation have been given by policymaking officials of these agencies only to have operational cooperation break down as a result of opposition from or misunderstanding on the part of middle management and line supervision personnel. Since these latter levels of management frequently lack the broad vision and enlightened commitment of those at the top level, intensive orientation and close monitoring and supervision through the agency's own administrative channels are usually necessary. With failure in this, actual operational cooperation is seriously impeded and sometimes even lacking in spite of commitments made at top levels.

Difficulties in securing and maintaining cooperation between E & D projects and other agencies vital to the achievement of project goals have been repeatedly referred to in this study. One suggestion offered as a possible remedy would be to obtain qualified professionals to conduct modified "sensitivity training" or training labs involving project and cooperating agency staffs at the line,supervisory, and management levels. These labs would involve intensive group interaction for 30 or more hours over three days and be aimed at developing meaningful interpersonal relationship, understanding, and partial resolution of differing program orientations and philosophies, and sharing of relevant experiences. The lab should be held before the project opens its doors and may be repeated at regular intervals or as needed to sustain close relationships and cooperation. It is important that the emotional or affective side of cooperation be explored as well as the formal or procedural aspects. This type of lab experience has been effective in Los Angeles and Chicago E & D projects as well as with Operation Headstart and Vocational Rehabilitation staffs in California and is widely used in private industry.

Usually, however, the labs have been held with selected staff members of a given agency or institution. We are suggesting that this concept be extended to include staff from cooperating or co-participating agencies combined with project staff members (e.g., several E & D project staff members and school and employment service personnel involved with the E & D project.)

### D. Follow-up to Enhance Impact

Once a given E & D project is sufficiently far along to provide convincing evidence of significant findings, a new proposal specifically directed toward effecting utilization of those findings can be planned and funded. Such a proposal can be initiated by the project staff or encouraged by OMPER and worked out with the project staff. One example of this approach exists to some degree in the BES-funded extension of the National Committee for Children and Youth E & D project (providing employability services for disadvantaged youth whose receptivity was heightened by their recent rejection as volunteers for military service because of academic deficiencies.) In the BES-funded extension of this project, NCCY staff are being utilized as innovation-experienced trainers and catalysts to set up similar services in Youth Opportunity Centers in a number of cities across the United States. In what might be called a "utilization project", E & D project staff experienced and knowledgeable concerning a given innovation or approach, are employed in a planned way to "build in" innovations in appropriate "user" agencies and institutions. We recommend that further projects of this type be undertaken.

OMPER's Division of Program Utilization already is in process of actively promoting the spread of findings from a current E & D youth project especially suitable for metamorphosis into a "utilization" project, namely, the one at the Draper Correctional Center at Elmore, Alabama. This project has several valuable features. It convincingly demonstrates that youthful inmates can be effectively trained for available skilled jobs and placed in the community with good chance of success. In the course of the project, various programmed instructional materials were developed which show great promise in the training of the disadvantaged. This project has received full support from the State Department of Corrections and most other agencies with which it deals. The staff is able, experienced, dedicated and enthusiastic. For these reasons, plus the evident need for practicable methods and techniques for increasing the employability of correctional inmates, this project is eminently suitable for extension as a utilization project, as OMPER has recognized.

Perhaps other projects such as these could be selected for utilization extension while their staffs were still present and involved under E & D auspices, and before they had scattered, as often happens, to new opportunities elsewhere. Plans can be drawn up and appropriate funding provided for selected project staff, perhaps in conjunction with outside management consultants, to operate as "missionaries" or "change agents" to carry out various utilization strategies in selected institutions which have already demonstrated interest through their inquiries and visits.

Selected key staff members from successful demonstration projects can be used as part of a "utilization project" to test the feasibility of various utilization strategies. These projects, either during their normal life span or during an extension, can be modified to serve as a "teaching project" through seminars, workshops and internships for selected staff members from potential "user" agencies. Or, the utilization and teaching features can be combined in a given successor to a more conventional E & D project.

There is another kind of follow-up that can enhance impact or utilization of findings, namely, an evaluation follow-up study itself. If such study reveals that the project has succeeded in achieving some important objectives more effectively than is usually achieved by conventional practices, such evidence, properly disseminated, can lend credence and provide additional impact force. But such studies in the past usually have been undertaken when the project was better than half completed, if not near tne end. This procedure needs reexamination. If an evaluation team comes in when the project is near termination, it not only is too late for feedback of findings to be of practical value for project improvements, but the staff begins to drift away to other more lasting jobs. Missing reports and statistical data cannot always be created at that late point in time, and optimal payoff cannot be achieved from the evaluation. It is recommended that a certain amount of in-house evaluation and regular feedback be built into every E & D project proposal that is funded. Then, as soon as it appears from the progress reports that there are some things of a special value to be learned by a full-fledged, independent outside follow-up study, this outside study can be undertaken as early as practicable, and planned in collaboration with consultants from the project staff and the OMPER program staff.

Still a different kind of needed follow-up is qualified, unobtrusive personal follow-up contact with the client graduates of E & D retraining projects, to offer help in getting jobs and counseling toward keeping jobs and maintaining a satisfactory personal and community adjustment.

## E. Miscellaneous Learnings and Recommendations

- In future efforts to do manpower work with the disadvantaged, try to borrow as paid full-time consulting staff, at least one knowledgeable and respected, influential person who might be loaned from each community organization and agency which frequently might become involved with these persons, e.g., labor unions, public assistance, police, vocational rehabilitation, public health, education, vocational education. In effect, try to obtain a knowledgeable multi-disciplinary staff, then utilize and integrate their special know-how and talents around the challenging problem of dealing with and rehabilitating the clients in relation to the project objectives. The closer the relationship and interchange between the E & D projects and the community agencies which serve these same persons, the better the chance of cooperation and coordination of efforts. Staff interchange may be one good way of promoting understanding and cooperation, at least in some situations.

- Try to arrange periodic regional conferences with the key staffs of various OMPER E & D projects and perhaps some related ones sponsored by other agencies...to share insights, frustrations, procedures and success stories. Promote learning and sharing from other toilers in the vineyard...and provide for recognition, appreciation and encouragement of each other and by "the powers that be".

- Use experienced E & D staff and other experts as consultants to regular agencies to help them implement E & D demonstrated innovations contained in guidelines for regular programs. Such help could have appreciably increased and speeded the actual and successful use of outreach, employment of nonprofessionals, group counseling, etc. by YOC's and other anti-poverty programs. Often guidelines and funds are insufficient to insure adoption of innovations. Concrete, on-the-job help in the implementation of new techniques and procedures needs to be increased to insure maximum long-range E & D project impact.

- Conduct training courses (taught by experienced, innovative E & D staff) in the important area of job development, including the creative involvment of management and labor. More work is needed in developing new types of jobs as contrasted with finding openings in pre-existing job categories. The whole "New Careers for the Poor" concept needs further application in E & D projects, especially those involving collaboration with or preparation for employment in private industry.

- Replicate, where suitable, the successful one-stop, neighborhood based, multi-service center. (This, we learn, is now being done under the leadership of HUD).

- Expand the use of nonprofessional volunteers in appropriate segments of E & D projects, and perhaps employ selected clients of given E & D projects for work in the project itself, or in other community agencies which might utilize some of the project findings. These persons then could make use of their own successful experience gained when they were clients of the E & D project.

- Replicate, where suitable, the New York City successful experience in retraining disadvantaged youth in a camp setting where total enrollment is small enough to retain many aspects of a home-like rather than an institutional atmosphere. (New York City now is engaged in more extensive experimental work to follow up its initial camps project.)

- Encourage E & D youth projects to replicate the successful experience of inviting employers to come to the project site to observe the retraining program in operation, and to interview in that relatively secure atmosphere the trainees who are deemed by the staff to be ready for employment.

- Inquire of local E & D project staff whether they feel they have sufficient flexibility in their contract provisions, within broad OMPER policy, to be able to adjust to local needs. If not, review the situation with them.
- Institute Career Service Awards, or a sabbatical time period (six months to one year) no oftener than every four years nor less often than every seven years for all key professional and administrative staff who are judged capable of thereby probably making a significant contribution to OMPER, the government, and their own development.
- Provide in-service training for OMPER professional program staff and research people in report writing and editing.
- Refrain from funding any project, no matter how needed or valuable the service it proposes to perform, until the E & D and service design has been coupled with some appropriate means -- control groups, or baseline data, or before-after measures, or video tape recordings, or whatever may be appropriate to the given situation and type of project -- for measuring efficacy of the different parts of the service to be offered and of the total intervention effort.
- Support studies of the "dynamics" of unusually successful important projects as soon as it appears evident that a given E & D project which is attacking an important problem is, in fact, achieving a breakthrough or major advance of some kind. By "dynamics" we mean the living elements of what the people involved did to achieve the seemingly unusual results, not just the outcome statistics or summaries of procedures and forms. Video-tape recordings, participant-observer case study reports, recorded interviews with those involved (E & D project staff, clients, other agencies, etc.) may be appropriate for this purpose.

We would now like to offer an overall impression gained from reading more than 50 project reports from OMPER-funded E & D projects, from personal site visits to 14 projects in nine cities, and from our other relevant work experience in the rehabilitation and poverty fields.

E & D projects focused on the rehabilitation of culturally disadvantaged youths, school dropouts, hard-core unemployed adults and other categories of persons in our society who have evidenced difficulty in making a living and "staying out of special trouble"...have increased greatly in number and type since about 1963. From trial-and-error and experience in this relatively recent, vastly stepped-up effort to cope with such problems, much has been learned. But the learning has been here and there; by small groups of staff personnel in certain governmental agencies; by this project or that project; by this city or that city.

The hard-won insights, new procedures and skills have not been systematically recorded. They have not been comprehensively shared through easily available and easy-to-read written collations and distillations, and the learnings have not been brought together into a training center (or regional training centers) to help the staff of new E & D projects engaged in the Poverty War and Crime War and related socioeconomic, civil rights, health-education-welfare, and job wars...to profit from the valuable experiences of others fighting similar battles during approximately similar times, under approximately similar conditions but in different places. As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has pointed out, "There is no adequate clearinghouse to collect and disseminate information on programs and approaches being used across the nation to improve education for culturally and economically deprived children." *

We need a kind of multi-agency sponsored federal-state-municipal "War College" to learn from past and current situations, to sift "intelligence" reports, and thereby upgrade our capabilities and get better

---

* Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment. Third Report, 1966.

payoff for precious dollars spent on these important battles to make our democracy work better.

OMPER has taken the lead in this direction through its current Operation Retrieval effort to retrieve the new knowledge and insights gained from E & D projects for disadvantaged youth which have been funded by the Department of Labor. OEO, OE, VRA, NIMH, SSA, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, and private-sector groups such as the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty, National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a number of industrial corporations, various private foundations such as Ford, Russel Sage, Rosenberg, Stern Family Fund, Rockefeller, and Carnegie likewise have accumulated a wealth of relevant knowledge and experience. If we could now get to work with an adequate task force or commission composed of appropriate federal agency program personnel, key personnel from successful E & D and R & D projects, from private sector and foundation people, and any needed consultants...great progress could be made quickly in profiting from what we have learned from these hard, costly but often brilliantly creative and heart-warming experiences. By some arrangement such as this, we can become positioned to put this knowledge to better use in the field as well as at the policy level, and provide an ongoing top quality training school for key E & D project personnel. Written distillations of experience, such as the Operation Retrieval book, and selected E & D final reports, can serve as source reading material in a training course, but written material alone will not take the place of face-to-face conference discussions, simulation games, site visits and all the other training devices inherent in the "War College" idea, especially for the key staff of new E & D projects.

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Martin Stone, the president of Monogram Industries, gave an address before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco in which he said: "I cannot believe that private industry opposes the aims of the Poverty Program or, in effect, is not sympathetic with the desire to rid the United States of poverty...My own company, Monogram Industries, has set up a trainee program for people with no previous skills and has employed 39 trainees against a total work force of 500 people. After a 10-month training program, the trainees earn a minimum of $2.10 per hour and have acquired skills necessary to assure them...continuity of employment at Monogram...or in numerous other companies...

"The federal government is engaged in an absolutely necessary, but badly conceived war on poverty... Virtually every function now being conducted by the federal government under the scope of the Poverty Program (particularly the educational phase and the job training phase) can be far better accomplished by the institutions of private industry, the agencies of private service organizations, and local government. These are the organizations which can best do the job. The proper role of the Federal Government should be the financial support of these existing institutions."

In December, 1966, the Christian Science Monitor published a series of articles entitled, "The Other War on Poverty." On August 9, 1966, LOOK Magazine ran an article entitled, "The Private War on Poverty." On April 3, 1967, U.S. News & World Report had an article entitled, "Business Sets Up Its Own Great Society." On April 19, 1967, the Wall Street Journal ran an article relevant to industrial support of

"Great Society" programs. The NAM is trying to launch a concentrated effort to marshal the resources of those companies already committed -- while at the same time beginning to mobilize the resources of those not yet engaged in such "social problem" activities -- on a nationwide basis.

This new and growing willingness of the institutions of private enterprise to accept responsibility for an important role in the fight against poverty and other social ills is all to the good, and has indeed been stimulated by E & D projects, Community Actions Programs, and R & D projects of federal agencies such as OMPER, OEO, OE, VRA, NIMH. An agency like OMPER might now take constructive advantage of this growing readiness for social engineering in the private sector by offering its experience as a "helping hand" or consultant, and its resources in funding worthwhile action projects by private organizations, just as it would support worthwhile projects undertaken by public or nonprofit organizations. By support for seemingly excellent, innovative demonstrations that offer good potential for spread, continuity, spinoff or spillover -- whether they are carried out by public agencies, private institutions or nonprofit organizations -- complementary diverse approaches can be harnessed for greater impact. OMPER already is moving in that direction by supporting activities which involve a greater employer role in training and employing the disadvantaged. Chicago's JOBS NOW project and Newark's Business and Industrial Coordinating Council are serving as OMPER-supported models.

One other very important need is for some agency or combination of agencies, such as OMPER, BAT, The Bureau of Work Programs, OEO, NIMH, VRA, to describe, distill and reproduce the most useful tools and techniques developed by the many E & D projects over the past few years. There have been many innovative advances for dealing with given rehabilitation problems such as remedial education, diagnostic techniques, counseling with various categories of persons, vocational skills training, communications skills training in social adjustment skills, etc. The findings, procedures and forms are scattered -- and in effect often buried -- in hundreds of mostly not-easily-available final reports to funding agencies. Beyond OMPER's excellent Operation Retrieval effort limited to OMPER-supported youth projects, a comprehensive series of streamlined handbooks is needed to bring together the most important things learned from all projects bearing upon our major societal problems. One limited excellent example of an attempt to meet this need is a description of THE REMEDIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM developed by Mobilization for Youth, in New York. Their report was sponsored by OMPER and four cooperating agencies: Human Resources Administration of New York City, National Institute of Mental Health, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and Neighborhood Youth Corps.

# APPENDIX A

## E & D PROJECTS VISITED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Alabama State Board of Correction<br>(Draper Correctional Center) | Elmore, Alabama |
| 2. | Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles<br>Youth Training and Employment Projects | Los Angeles, Calif. |
| 3. | San Francisco Committee on Youth<br>(Hunters Point Project) | San Francisco, Calif. |
| 4. | National Committee for Children and Youth | Washington, D.C. |
| 5. | National Institute for Labor Education | National |
| 6. | Job Opportunities Through Better Skills | Chicago, Illinois |
| 7. | Mayor's Youth Employment Project | Detroit, Michigan |
| 8. | St. Louis Jewish Employment and Vocational Service | St. Louis, Missouri |
| 9. | Mobilization for Youth | New York, New York |
| 10. | YMCA of Greater New York, New York City | New York, New York |
| 11. | New York City Youth Board<br>(Camp Madison-Felicia) | New York City |
| 12. | New York City Board of Education | New York, New York |
| 13. | Police Athletic League, Inc. | New York, New York |
| 14. | Citizens' Committee on Youth | Cincinnati, Ohio |

## APPENDIX B

### E & D Projects Reviewed in This Study Which Have Been "Spun-Off" to Continuing Operation by Regular Programs

| Project | Present Principal Funding |
|---|---|
| ABCD (Boston) | OEO funded |
| JOBS (Chicago) | OEO funded |
| CPI (New Haven) | OEO funded |
| Lane County Youth Board (Oregon) | OEO funded |
| YOB (Los Angeles) | OEO funded |
| MFY (New York City) | OEO funded |
| Jewish Vocational Service, Inc. (Kansas City, Mo.) | BAT funded |
| Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries (Washington, D.C.) | BAT funded |
| Altro Workshops, Inc. (New York City) | BAT funded |
| National Committee on the Employment of Youth | BAT funded |
| NCCY Volunteer Military Rejectees Project (in 5 cities other than Baltimore and D.C.) | OMPER funded,<br>BES operated |
| Washington Action for Youth (Washington, D.C.) | OEO-UPO funded |
| Action Housing, Inc. (Pittsburgh) | OEO funded |
| Office of Economic Opportunity (New Jersey) | OEO funded |
| San Francisco Committee on Youth (Hunters Point) | BES (YOC) funded |
| Community Action for Youth (Cleveland) | BES funded |
| Crusade for Opportunity (Syracuse, New York) | OEO funded |